arXiv:1403.4124v1 [math.AP] 17 Mar 2014

Large mass global solutions for a class of L^1-critical nonlocal aggregation equations and parabolic-elliptic Patlak-Keller-Segel models

Jacob Bedrossian*

March 18, 2014

Abstract

We consider a class of L^1 critical nonlocal aggregation equations with linear or nonlinear porous media-type diffusion which are characterized by a long-range interaction potential that decays faster than the Newtonian potential at infinity. The fast decay breaks the L^1 scaling symmetry and we prove that 'sufficiently spread out' initial data, regardless of the mass, result in global spreading solutions. This is in contrast to the classical parabolic-elliptic PKS for which essentially all solutions with more than critical mass are known to blow up in finite time. In all cases, the long-time asymptotics are given by the self-similar solution to the linear heat equation or by the Barenblatt solutions of the porous media equation. The results with linear diffusion are proved using properties of the Fokker-Planck semi-group whereas the results with nonlinear diffusion are proved using a more interesting bootstrap argument coupling the entropy-entropy dissipation methods of the porous media equation together with higher L^p estimates similar to those used in small-data and local theory for PKS-type equations.

1 Introduction

The focus of this work is to study the following general class of equations in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$:

$$\begin{cases} u_t + \nabla \cdot (u \nabla c) = \Delta u^m, \ \ m \geq 1, \\ c = \mathcal{K} * u, \\ u(0) = u_0 \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^d; (1+|x|^2)dx) \ \ d \geq 2, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^d;\mu) := \left\{ f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d;\mu) : f \geq 0 \right\}$. In what follows we will always denote $\|u(t)\|_1 = M$, which is conserved in time for any reasonable notion of solution. The prototype for this set of equations is the classical parabolic-elliptic Patlak-Keller-Segel (PKS), which corresponds to the choices $m = 1$ and $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N}$ denotes the Newtonian potential:

$$\begin{cases} u_t + \nabla \cdot (u \nabla c) = \Delta u, \\ -\Delta c = u. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

The PKS model is generally considered to be one of the fundamental models of nonlocal aggregation phenomena, especially aggregation via chemotaxis in certain microorganisms [49, 35, 32, 31]. Generalizations

*jacob@cims.nyu.edu, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences. Partially supported by NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship in Mathematical Sciences, DMS-1103765

with nonlinear diffusion (which models an overcrowding effect) and more general nonlocal interactions such as (1.1) have been proposed as models in a variety of ecological systems [17, 56, 45, 30]. Variants of (1.1) and (1.2) also sometimes appear in physical settings [43, 52]; see also [39]. The class (1.1) is generally characterized by the competition between the tendency for organisms to diffuse (either under Brownian motion when $m = 1$ or to avoid overcrowding when $m > 1$) and the tendency for organisms to aggregate through nonlocal attraction. The models can also be seen as the local repulsive limit of inviscid attractive-repulsive aggregation equations which arise both in biology and material science (see e.g. [18, 8, 2, 1] and the references therein).

The wealth of mathematical work on (1.2) and the variants (1.1) is vast so we will not attempt to make a survey here. It is well-known that in $\mathbb{R}^2$, (1.2) is L^1 critical (in the sense that the scaling symmetry of (1.2) preserves the L^1 norm) and has a critical mass phenomena (see e.g. [27, 16]): if $\|u\|_1 = M < 8\pi$ then the solution is global and converges to the unique, self-similar spreading solution whereas if $\|u\|_1 = M > 8\pi$ then the solution blows up in finite time (at least if it has a finite second moment). Solutions with exactly critical mass exhibit a variety of possible behaviors including infinite-time aggregation [15] and convergence to stationary solutions [13]. In $\mathbb{R}^3$, (1.2) is L^1 (and free energy) supercritical and little beyond small $L^{3/2}$ global existence results (see e.g. [11, 46, 25]) and large $L^{3/2}$ finite time blow up results is known ($L^{3/2}$ is the critical Lebesgue space). In $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \geq 3$, the choice $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{N}$ and $m = 2-2/d$ is L^1 critical, and it was shown in [14] that (1.1) with these choices has properties similar to those of (1.2) in $\mathbb{R}^2$: there exists a critical mass M_c such that if $\|u\|_1 = M < M_c$ then the solution is global and converges to self-similar spreading solutions whereas if $\|u\|_1 = M > M_c$, then at least large classes of solutions are known to blow up in finite time (see [14, 5]). Critical mass phenomena also occurs in the more general class (1.1) for suitable choices of $\mathcal{K}$ and m (including also more general filtration equation-type diffusion) [7, 6, 34].

The purpose of this work is to show that for the L^1 critical models ($m = 2 - 2/d$ in $d \geq 2$), if $\mathcal{K}$ decays faster than the Newtonian potential at infinity (in the sense that $\|\nabla\mathcal{K}\|_q < \infty$ for some $q < \frac{d}{d-1}$), then unlike the scale-invariant case, all sufficiently spread out solutions are global and converge to the self-similar spreading solution of the homogeneous diffusion equation $u_t = \Delta u^{2-2/d}$. In particular, this covers the well-known case of parabolic-elliptic PKS with lower order degradation term in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$ (which is known to have finite time blow-up solutions for all values of $M > M_c$):

$$\begin{cases} u_t + \nabla \cdot (u\nabla c) = \Delta u^{2-2/d}, \quad d \geq 2, \\ -\Delta c + \alpha c = u, \quad \alpha > 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

The results and proofs are perturbative in nature, treating (1.1) as a perturbation of the diffusion equation in forward self-similar variables. Usually in such perturbative settings, the mass (or size of $\mathcal{K}$) is required small, as in for example [21, 55, 42, 4]. However, here the small parameter that controls the nonlocal aggregation term is basically a measure of the characteristic length-scale of the initial data relative to $\|\nabla\mathcal{K}\|_q$ for some $q < \frac{d}{d-1}$ (which serves to measure the strength of the attraction on large length-scales) and some appropriate quantification of the size of the initial data. We remark that these results are somewhat analogous to behavior observed in the parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel models [24, 12], where the characteristic time-scale of chemo-attractant diffusion can be used as the small parameter.

That the long-time asymptotics should be governed only by the diffusion equation as $t \to \infty$ has already been observed in, for example, [41, 42, 4, 21]. The present work need only concentrate on extending the range of examples where strong decay estimates are known; indeed, for the cases we will study it was shown in [4] that sufficiently strong decay estimates imply that the solutions converge to the self-similar spreading solution of the diffusion equation.

We will restrict our attention to interaction potentials $\mathcal{K}$ that satisfy basic regularity requirements (this definition is originally from [7]). Note that while it is not necessary for this work to require $\mathcal{K}$ to be

radially non-increasing, which corresponds to $\mathcal{K}$ being purely attractive, the results are mostly interesting when $\mathcal{K}$ is attractive as this is opposing the diffusion.

Definition 1 (Admissible Kernel)**.** We say a kernel $\mathcal{K} \in C^3 \setminus \{0\}$ is *admissible* if $\mathcal{K} \in W^{1,1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and the following holds:

(KN) $\mathcal{K}$ is radially symmetric, $\mathcal{K}(x) = k(|x|)$ and $k(|x|)$ is monotone in a neighborhood of $x = 0$.

(MN) $k''(r)$ and $k'(r)/r$ are monotone on $r \in (0, \delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$.

(BD) $\left|D^3\mathcal{K}(x)\right| \lesssim |x|^{-d-1}$.

The definition ensures that the kernel is radially symmetric, well-behaved at the origin and has second derivatives which define bounded singular integral operators on L^p for $1 < p < \infty$. It is important to note that all admissible kernels satisfy $\nabla\mathcal{K} \in L^{\frac{d}{d-1},\infty}$, where $L^{p,\infty}$ denotes the weak-L^p space, making the Newtonian potential effectively the most singular of admissible kernels [7]. Provided $\mathcal{K}$ is admissible, for a given initial condition $u_0(x) \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^d; (1+|x|^2)dx) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, (1.1) has a unique, local-in-time weak solution which satisfies $u(t) \in C([0,T); L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^d; (1+|x|^2)dx)) \cap L^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $T \leq \infty$ (see e.g. [7, 9, 16, 55, 6]).

In the case of linear diffusion, we will be using strong contractive properties of the Fokker-Planck semi-group which rely on a spectral gap for the associated elliptic problem (see Proposition 1). This generally requires some kind of weighted space; here we define the weighted L^2 norm:

$$\|f\|^2_{L^2(\beta)} = \int \left(1+|x|^2\right)^{2\beta} |f(x)|^2 \, dx,$$

with the space $L^2(\beta) = \left\{ f \in L^1 : \|f\|_{L^2(\beta)} < \infty \right\}$. In what follows denote $\langle x \rangle = (1+|x|^2)^{1/2}$. The statement of Theorem 1 is given below.

Theorem 1 (Linear diffusion)**.** *Let $d = 2$, $m = 1$ and suppose $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies Definition 1 and $\|\nabla\mathcal{K}\|_q < \infty$ for some $q < 2$. Then for all $f \in L^1_+ \cap L^2(\beta)$ for some $\beta > 2$, there exists a $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\|f\|_{L^2(\beta)}, \|f\|_1, \beta, \mathcal{K})$ such that if $\lambda > \lambda_0$ and we take the initial data in* (1.1) *to be*

$$u_0(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f\left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right), \tag{1.4}$$

then the corresponding solution to (1.1) *is global and satisfies the L^∞ decay estimate for $t \geq 1$:*

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty \lesssim t^{-1}. \tag{1.5}$$

If $|\nabla\mathcal{K}(x)| \lesssim |x|^{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 1$ then we have the convergence to self-similarity: for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\left\|u(t) - e^{t\Delta}u_0\right\|_1 \lesssim_\delta (1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\min(1,\gamma-1)+\delta}. \tag{1.6}$$

To state our result regarding nonlinear diffusions, recall the self-similar Barenblatt solution of the porous media equation for $m = 2 - 2/d$ [57]:

$$\mathcal{U}(t,x;M) = t^{-1}\left(C_1 - \frac{(m-1)}{2md}\left(\frac{|x|}{t^{\frac{1}{d}}}\right)^2\right)_+^{\frac{1}{m-1}}, \tag{1.7}$$

where C_1 is determined from the conservation of mass. Then our result on nonlinear diffusion is stated below. The proof is a bootstrap argument that couples a high L^p estimate of the type that arises in

the perturbative local or small-data data theory of (1.1) (see e.g. [33, 37, 20, 14, 25, 4]) together with an entropy-entropy dissipation argument based on the inequalities for the porous media equation (see e.g. [23, 22]), sometimes considered the nonlinear analogue of a spectral gap. That (1.9) implies (1.10) a posteriori is proved in [4] using entropy methods (see also [21]), however, the proof of Theorem 2 is the only example, to the author's knowledge, of a method for PKS-type equations that couples the entropy methods together with perturbative higher L^p estimates to prove a decay estimate of the type (1.9).

Theorem 2 (Nonlinear diffusion)**.** *Let $d \geq 3$, $m = 2 - 2/d$ and suppose $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies Definition 1 and $\|\nabla \mathcal{K}\|_q < \infty$ for some $q < \frac{d}{d-1}$. Then for all $f \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^d; (1+|x|^2)dx) \cap L^\infty$, there exists a $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(f, \mathcal{K}, d)$ such that if $\lambda > \lambda_0$ and we take the initial data in (1.1) to be*

$$u_0(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^d} f\left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right), \tag{1.8}$$

then the corresponding solution to (1.1) is global and satisfies the L^∞ decay estimate:

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty \lesssim (1+t)^{-1}. \tag{1.9}$$

If $|\nabla \mathcal{K}(x)| \lesssim |x|^{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > d-1$ then we have the convergence to self-similarity: for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\|u(t) - \mathcal{U}(t, x; M)\|_1 \lesssim_\delta (1+t)^{-\frac{1}{d}\min(1, \gamma - d + 1) + \delta}. \tag{1.10}$$

Remark 1. For L^1 supercritical cases $1 \leq m < 2 - 2/d$ (for example the case of parabolic-elliptic PKS in $\mathbb{R}^3$), both Theorems 1 and 2 are immediate from small data $L^{\frac{d(2-m)}{2}}$ global existence results even in the case $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{N}$ (see for example [25, 55, 54, 4]). For more information on supercritical cases, see also [10] and the references therein.

Remark 2. For subcritical problems $m > 2 - 2/d$ the question of long time behavior has a number of gaps as the aggregation can dominate on large length-scales in these cases. To the author's knowledge, no decaying solution for (1.1) with $m > 2 - 2/d$ has ever been exhibited for an attractive choice of $\mathcal{K}$ (e.g. $\nabla \mathcal{K} \cdot x \leq 0$). It is known that in the case $2 - 2/d < m < 2$, stationary solutions exist for sufficiently large mass for basically all purely attractive choices of $\mathcal{K}$ [40] (in fact this is true over the entire range $1 < m < 2$ depending on the singularity of the kernel). The case $m = 2$ is critical from this perspective [3, 19] and in the case $m > 2$ there exists stationary solutions for all values of the mass for basically all radially-symmetric, attractive $\mathcal{K}$ [3]. In some cases, convergence to stationary solutions has been established [36].

Remark 3. If $\gamma \geq d$ then the convergence rates in (1.6) and (1.10) are nearly optimal in the sense that they match the rate of the diffusion equation (up to the δ) [23, 57]. In both Theorems 1 and 2, if $\nabla \mathcal{K} \in L^1$ we may take $\gamma = d$ in the statement.

Remark 4. Note that the regularity of $\mathcal{K}$ is essentially irrelevant, it is only the decay at infinity (as long as $\mathcal{K}$ is not more singular than the Newtonian potential). For example, both the statements and the proofs of Theorems 1 or 2 are the same regardless if we are considering $\mathcal{K}(x) = e^{-|x|^2}$ or $\mathcal{K}$ the fundamental solution of $-\Delta c + \alpha c = 0$ for $\alpha > 0$ and there is no obvious simplification possible in the case of the former.

2 Linear diffusion

Define the Fokker-Planck operator and linear semi-group

$$Lf = \Delta f + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot (\xi f)$$
$$S(\tau) = e^{\tau L}.$$

We will use some of the following properties of the linear propagator $S(\tau)$ in $L^2(\beta)$, studied in [28].

Proposition 1 (Properties of $S(\tau)$ (see [28]))**.** *Fix $\beta > 1$. Then,*

(i) $S(\tau)$ defines a strongly continuous semi-group on $L^2(\beta)$ and for all $w \in L^2(\beta)$,

$$\|S(\tau)w\|_{L^2(\beta)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\beta)}, \quad \|\nabla S(\tau)w\|_{L^2(\beta)} \lesssim \frac{1}{a(\tau)^{1/2}} \|w\|_{L^2(m)}, \tag{2.1}$$

for all $\tau > 0$ and where $a(\tau) = 1 - e^{-\tau}$.

(ii) If $\beta > 2$ and $w \in L^2_0(\beta)$, then

$$\|S(\tau)w\|_{L^2(\beta)} \lesssim e^{-\tau/2} \|w\|_{L^2(\beta)}, \quad \forall \tau > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

(iii) If $q \in [1, 2]$ then for all $w \in L^q(\beta)$ and $\tau > 0$,

$$\|S(\tau)w\|_{L^2(\beta)} \lesssim \frac{1}{a(\tau)^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}}} \|w\|_{L^q(\beta)} \tag{2.3}$$

$$\|\nabla S(\tau)w\|_{L^2(\beta)} \lesssim \frac{1}{a(\tau)^{\frac{1}{q}}} \|w\|_{L^q(\beta)}. \tag{2.4}$$

Note that

$$\nabla S(\tau) = e^{\tau/2} S(\tau) \nabla. \tag{2.5}$$

With Proposition 1, we may prove Theorem 1 with a short perturbation argument.

(Proof of Theorem 1). Denote $u(t, x)$ to be the unique solution to (1.1) with initial data (1.4), which is known to exist on some time interval $[0, T_{\max})$ by local well-posedness. Define the parameter $T > 0$ to be chosen large later:

$$T = (\lambda^2 - 1).$$

Define the self-similar variables (τ, ξ),

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= ((t + T) + 1)^{-1/2} x \\ \tau &= \log((t + T) + 1), \end{aligned}$$

together with the rescaled solution

$$\theta(\tau, \xi) = ((t + T) + 1) u(t, x),$$

which is defined on the time interval $[\tau_0, \tau_{\max})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_0 &= \log(T + 1) \\ \tau_{\max} &= \log((T_{\max} + T) + 1). \end{aligned}$$

In these variables, (1.1) with initial data (1.4) becomes the system

$$\theta_\tau + \nabla \cdot (\theta e^{\tau/2} (\nabla \mathcal{K})(e^{\tau/2} \cdot) * \theta) = \Delta \theta + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot (\xi \theta) \tag{2.6a}$$

$$\theta(\tau_0, \xi) = f(\xi). \tag{2.6b}$$

The idea behind the introduction of T is that if u_0 has a characteristic length scale $O(\sqrt{T})$, then $\theta(\tau_0)$ has a characteristic length scale of $O(1)$. The parameter T will eventually be required large to ensure that the initial data lives on a much larger length-scale than the interaction range of the potential.

Applying Duhamel's formula to (2.6) gives

$$\theta(\tau) = S(\tau-\tau_0)f - \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} S(\tau-s)\left[\nabla\cdot(\theta e^{s/2}(\nabla\mathcal{K})(e^{s/2}\cdot)*\theta(s))\right]ds.$$

We will be essentially linearizing around the approximate solution $S(\tau-\tau_0)f$. Let $[\tau_0,\tau_\star]$ be the largest connected, closed interval such that

$$\|\theta(\tau) - S(\tau-\tau_0)f\|_{L^2(\beta)} \leq 4, \tag{2.7}$$

which is well-defined and non-empty by the continuity in time of $\theta(\tau)$ and $S(\tau)$ (Proposition 1). Moreover, by standard propagation of regularity, the solution $\theta(\tau)$ is C^∞ for $\tau\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star]$. Using the crucial decay estimate (2.4), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta(\tau) - S(\tau-\tau_0)f\|_{L^2(\beta)} &\leq \left\|\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} S(\tau-s)\left[\nabla\cdot(\theta e^{s/2}(\nabla\mathcal{K})(e^{s/2}\cdot)*\theta(s))\right]ds\right\|_{L^2(\beta)}\\ &\lesssim \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau}\frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\tau-s)}}{a(\tau-s)^{3/4}}\left\|\theta e^{s/2}(\nabla\mathcal{K})(e^{s/2}\cdot)*\theta\right\|_{L^{4/3}(\beta)}ds.\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

By Hölder's inequality:

$$\left\|\langle\xi\rangle^m\theta e^{s/2}(\nabla\mathcal{K})(e^{s/2}\cdot)*\theta\right\|_{4/3} \leq \|\theta\|_{L^2(\beta)}\left\|e^{s/2}\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^{s/2}\cdot)*\theta\right\|_4. \tag{2.9}$$

The key here is to use Young's inequality and put $\nabla\mathcal{K}$ in an L^z space with $z<2$, breaking the scale invariance that would be present if $\mathcal{K}$ were the Newtonian potential (in which case we would only have $\nabla\mathcal{K}\in L^{2,\infty}$). Since $\nabla\mathcal{K}\in L^{2,\infty}$, by interpolation, $\nabla\mathcal{K}$ is in every L^z space with $z\in[q,2)$. Therefore, by choosing $q\leq z<2$ we may ensure by Young's inequality that, for some $1<p<2$ we have

$$\left\|e^{s/2}(\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^{s/2}\cdot)*\theta)\right\|_4 \lesssim \|\theta\|_p\left\|e^{s/2}\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^{s/2}\cdot)\right\|_z = e^{\frac{s}{2}\left(1-\frac{2}{z}\right)}\|\theta\|_p\|\nabla\mathcal{K}\|_z.$$

Since $p<2$ and $\beta>2$, by Hölder's inequality we have $\|\theta\|_p\lesssim_\beta\|\theta\|_{L^2(\beta)}$, so by $\nabla\mathcal{K}\in L^z$ we have

$$\left\|e^{s/2}(\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^{s/2}\cdot)*\theta)\right\|_4 \lesssim e^{\frac{s}{2}\left(1-\frac{2}{z}\right)}\|\theta\|_{L^2(\beta)}.$$

This exponential decay factor introduces the small parameter we can exploit to close the perturbation argument. Using this together with (2.9) and (2.8) gives us

$$\|\theta(\tau) - S(\tau-\tau_0)f\|_{L^2(\beta)} \lesssim e^{\left(1-\frac{2}{z}\right)\frac{\tau_0}{2}}\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau}\frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\tau-s)}}{a(\tau-s)^{3/4}}\|\theta(s)\|_{L^2(\beta)}^2\,ds.$$

Therefore, by the bootstrap hypothesis (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta(\tau) - S(\tau-\tau_0)f\|_{L^2(\beta)} &\lesssim e^{\left(1-\frac{2}{z}\right)\frac{\tau_0}{2}}\sup_{s\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)}\|\theta(s)\|_{L^2(\beta)}^2\\ &\lesssim e^{\left(1-\frac{2}{z}\right)\frac{\tau_0}{2}}\left(1+\sup_{s\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)}\|S(\tau-\tau_0)f\|_{L^2(\beta)}^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.1) from Proposition 1 implies

$$\|\theta(\tau) - S(\tau-\tau_0)f\|_{L^2(\beta)} \leq C_1 e^{\left(1-\frac{2}{z}\right)\frac{\tau_0}{2}} + C_2 e^{\left(1-\frac{2}{z}\right)\frac{\tau_0}{2}} \|f\|^2_{L^2(\beta)},$$

where both C_1 and C_2 are independent of f, τ_0 and $\tau_\star$ (they depend only on $\mathcal{K}$, q, β and the constants coming from Proposition 1). By assumption, $\|f\|_{L^2(\beta)} < \infty$ and hence we may fix τ_0 depending only on the constants C_i and $\|f\|_{L^2(\beta)}$ such that on $[\tau_0, \tau_\star)$ there holds,

$$\|\theta(\tau) - S(\tau-\tau_0)f\|_{L^2(\beta)} < 2.$$

Therefore, a continuity argument implies that $\tau_\star = \tau_{\max}$ and since $L^2(\beta)$ is a higher L^p space than the critical L^1 space, it is standard that the solution is global: $\tau_{\max} = \infty$ and $\|\theta(\tau) - S(\tau-\tau_0)f\|_{L^2(\beta)} < 2$ for all time. The uniform bound in $L^2(\beta)$ on θ implies the L^∞ decay estimate (1.5) by Theorem 1 (ii) in [4], and the convergence to self-similarity (1.6) follows from Theorem 2 or 3 in [4] (one could alternatively use a second argument via Duhamel's principle as in the methods of [21], which might be more natural for linear diffusion). □

3 Nonlinear diffusion

It is clear that the proof of Theorem 1 does not apply at all as it depends on the decay estimates of the Fokker-Planck semi-group, which are the consequence of an appropriate spectral gap for L in $L^2(\beta)$ (see [28]). We instead use the entropy-entropy dissipation inequalities for the porous media equation (see e.g. [23, 22]). In similarity variables ([57, 23] or (3.6) below with $T = 0$), the diffusion equation $u_t = \Delta u^{2-2/d}$ is transformed into the nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\theta_\tau = \Delta\theta^{2-2/d} + \nabla\cdot(\xi\theta), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\theta(\tau,\xi) = e^{\tau d}u(t,x)$. Define the entropy functional

$$H[\theta] = \frac{1}{m-1}\int \theta^m(\xi)d\xi + \frac{1}{2}\int |\xi|^2\,\theta(\xi)d\xi, \tag{3.2}$$

and the entropy production functional,

$$I[\theta] = \int \theta \left|\frac{m}{m-1}\nabla\theta(\xi)^{m-1} + \xi\right|^2 d\xi. \tag{3.3}$$

These entropies were originally introduced for studying the porous media equation in [47, 51]. It is well known that (3.2) is displacement convex [44] and that (3.1) is a gradient flow for (3.2) in the Euclidean Wasserstein distance [48]. Denote by θ_M the unique minimizer of the functional (3.2) with fixed mass M (which is simply the Barenblatt solution (1.7) of mass M written in similarity variables) and define the relative entropy

$$H[\theta|\theta_M] = H[\theta] - H[\theta_M] \geq 0.$$

The functionals are all related by the following: if $\theta(\tau,\xi)$ solves (3.1), then

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] = -I[\theta(\tau)]. \tag{3.4}$$

Then we have the following, which generalizes the Gross logarithmic Sobolev inequality [29] (see also [50]).

Proposition 2 (Generalized Gross Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality [23, 22, 50, 29]). *Let $f \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|f\|_1 = M$. Then,*

$$H[f|\theta_M] \leq \frac{1}{2} I[f]. \tag{3.5}$$

Equations (3.4) and (3.5), together with a suitable generalization of the Csiszar-Kullback inequality [26, 38, 23, 22], provide a sharp quantitative estimate on the rate of convergence of solutions to (3.1) to θ_M in L^1. Upon transforming back to the original variables, this becomes the convergence to self-similarity for the porous media equation.

To prove Theorem 2, we will begin as in (3.4) but will encounter an error term that requires control on a higher L^p norm. To control this, we couple the entropy-entropy dissipation argument with the truncated L^p estimate methods which are classical in the study of PKS and its variants. For example, related arguments can be found in [33, 37, 20, 14, 55, 4]. These methods allow to propagate arbitrary L^p estimates provided some uniform equi-integrability is known (see [20]), which here is provided in turn by control on the relative entropy. In order to close the bootstrap, the small parameter employed is the length-scale of the initial data.

(Proof of Theorem 2). Denote $u(t,x)$ to be the unique solution to (1.1) with initial data (1.8), which is known to exist on some time interval $[0, T_{\max})$ by local well-posedness. Define the parameter $T > 0$ to be chosen large later:

$$T = \frac{1}{d}(\lambda^d - 1).$$

As in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1, define the self-similar variables (τ, ξ) (we remark that the slightly different convention in the definition depending on d holds no real significance):

$$\xi = (d(t+T)+1)^{-1/d} x, \tag{3.6a}$$

$$\tau = \frac{1}{d} \log\left(d(t+T)+1\right), \tag{3.6b}$$

$$\theta(\tau, \xi) = (d(t+T)+1) u(t,x), \tag{3.6c}$$

which is defined on the time interval $[\tau_0, \tau_{\max})$, where

$$\tau_0 = \frac{1}{d} \log\left(dT+1\right),$$
$$\tau_{\max} = \frac{1}{d} \log\left(d(T_{\max}+T)+1\right).$$

Written with (3.6), (1.1) with initial data (1.8) becomes

$$\theta_\tau + \nabla \cdot (\theta e^{(d-1)\tau} (\nabla \mathcal{K})(e^\tau \cdot) * \theta) = \Delta \theta^m + \nabla \cdot (\xi \theta) \tag{3.7a}$$

$$\theta(\tau_0, \xi) = f(\xi). \tag{3.7b}$$

By the regularity assumptions in Theorem 2, $H[f|\theta_M] < \infty$ and since $H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M]$ takes values continuously in time, we may define $[\tau_0, \tau_\star]$ to be the largest connected time interval such that the following bootstrap hypothesis holds:

$$\sup_{\tau \in (\tau_0, \tau_\star)} H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] \leq 4 H[f|\theta_M]. \tag{3.8}$$

By propagation of regularity and continuity in time, $\tau_0 < \tau_\star < \tau_{\max}$ [20, 7]. The essential component of the proof of Theorem 2 is to prove that $\tau_\star = \infty$. Ultimately, we will be able to choose τ_0 large enough such that on $(\tau_0, \tau_\star)$, $H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] < 2H[f|\theta_M]$, and hence $\tau_\star = \infty$.

The first step is to compute the time evolution of the relative entropy as for instance in [21, 4] (note that these computations can be justified on $[\tau_0, \tau_{\max})$ by propagation of regularity [14, 7]). By Cauchy-Schwarz and the definition of the entropy production functional I (3.3), we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\tau}H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] &= -I[\theta] + e^{(N-1)\tau}\int \nabla\left(\frac{m\theta^{m-1}}{m-1} + \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^2\right)\cdot\theta\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^\tau\cdot)*\theta d\xi \\ &\leq -I[\theta] + e^{(N-1)\tau}I[\theta]^{1/2}\sqrt{\int\theta\left|\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^\tau\cdot)*\theta\right|^2 d\xi}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

The latter term is an error that we must control in order to propagate (3.8). By Hölder's inequality and Young's inequality:

$$\sqrt{\int\theta\left|\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^\tau\cdot)*\theta\right|^2 d\xi} \leq \|\theta\|_m^{1/2}\left\|\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^\tau\cdot)*\theta\right\|_{\frac{2m}{m-1}} \lesssim e^{-\frac{d\tau}{q}}\left\|\nabla\mathcal{K}\right\|_q\|\theta\|_m^{1/2}\|\theta\|_p, \tag{3.10}$$

where here $p \in \left[\frac{2md}{md+2m-d}, \frac{2m}{m-1}\right)$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{p} = 1 + \frac{m-1}{2m} - \frac{1}{q}. \tag{3.11}$$

Note that if $q = 1$, then $p = \frac{2m}{m-1}$; also note that for no choice of $d \geq 3$ do we get $p \leq m$ (since $m = 2 - 2/d$). Applying (3.10) to the evolution of the relative entropy (3.9) implies that for some constant $C > 0$ depending on $\mathcal{K}$,

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] \leq -I[\theta] + Ce^{\left(d-1-\frac{d}{q}\right)\tau}I[\theta]^{1/2}\|\theta\|_m^{1/2}\|\theta\|_p.$$

The exponent is negative due to the assumption that $q < \frac{d}{d-1}$ and this will provide the small parameter which we may use to close the bootstrap argument. For notational simplicity denote

$$\epsilon = -\left(d-1-\frac{d}{q}\right) > 0.$$

Since,

$$\frac{1}{m-1}\|\theta\|_m^m \leq H[\theta|\theta_M] + H[\theta_M],$$

we have (adjusting C each line),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\tau}H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] &\leq -I[\theta] + Ce^{-\epsilon\tau}I[\theta]^{1/2}\left(H[\theta|\theta_M]^{\frac{1}{2m}} + H[\theta_M]^{\frac{1}{2m}}\right)\|\theta\|_p \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}I[\theta] + Ce^{-2\epsilon\tau}\left(H[\theta|\theta_M]^{\frac{1}{m}} + H[\theta_M]^{\frac{1}{m}}\right)\|\theta\|_p^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}I[\theta] + \frac{1}{4}H[\theta|\theta_M] + Ce^{-\frac{2m}{(m-1)}\epsilon\tau}\|\theta\|_p^{\frac{2m}{m-1}} + CH[\theta_M]^{\frac{1}{m}}e^{-2\epsilon\tau}\|\theta\|_p^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the crucial (3.5) then implies

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] \leq -\frac{3}{4}H[\theta|\theta_M] + Ce^{-\frac{2m}{(m-1)}\epsilon\tau}\|\theta\|_p^{\frac{2m}{m-1}} + CH[\theta_M]^{\frac{1}{m}}e^{-2\epsilon\tau}\|\theta\|_p^2.$$

Integrating this over $(\tau_0, \tau_\star)$ gives (adjusting C again)

$$\sup_{\tau\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)} H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] \leq H[f|\theta_M] + Ce^{-\frac{2m}{(m-1)}\epsilon\tau_0}\left(\sup_{\tau\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)} \|\theta(\tau)\|_p^{\frac{2m}{m-1}}\right) + Ce^{-2\epsilon\tau_0}\left(\sup_{\tau\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)} \|\theta(\tau)\|_p^2\right). \tag{3.12}$$

Since $p > m$, in order to control the RHS of (3.12), we need a second estimate on the high norm L^p. This estimate will be obtained by truncated L^p estimate methods; we will especially model the arguments after those found in [37, 14, 20, 7]. The necessary equi-integrability will come from (3.12), coupling the high and low norm estimates together. Then τ_0 will be chosen large in order to close the argument.

Denote $\theta_k := (\theta - k)_+$ and recall that for all $1 \leq r < \infty$:

$$\|\theta\|_r^r \lesssim_r \|\theta_k\|_r^r + k^{r-1}\|\theta\|_1. \tag{3.13}$$

Compute the evolution of $\|\theta_k\|_p^p$, using that $\theta_k^l\theta = \theta_k^{l+1} + k\theta_k^l$ and $\nabla\theta^l = \nabla\theta_k^l$ for all $l > 0$:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\|\theta_k(\tau)\|_p^p = -\frac{4mp(p-1)}{(p+m-1)^2}\int\left|\nabla\theta_k^{\frac{p+m-1}{2}}\right|^2 d\xi - \int\left((p-1)\theta_k^p + kp\theta_k^{p-1}\right)\nabla\cdot\left(e^{(d-1)\tau}\nabla\mathcal{K}(e^\tau\cdot) * \theta\right)d\xi + d(p-1)\|\theta_k\|_{p+1}^{p+1} + dkp\|\theta_k\|_p^p.$$

By Hölder's inequality, the Calderon-Zygmund inequality [53] (applied to the singular integral operator $e^{d\tau}\Delta\mathcal{K}(e^\tau\cdot)$ – one can verify that the constants do not depend on τ [4]) and (3.13) (again adjusting C every line):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\tau}\|\theta_k(\tau)\|_p^p &\leq -\frac{4mp(p-1)}{(p+m-1)^2}\int\left|\nabla\theta_k^{\frac{p+m-1}{2}}\right|^2 d\xi + (p-1)\|\theta_k\|_{p+1}^p\left\|e^{d\tau}\Delta\mathcal{K}(e^\tau\cdot)*\theta\right\|_{p+1} \\ &\quad + kp\|\theta_k\|_p^{p-1}\left\|e^{d\tau}\Delta\mathcal{K}(e^\tau\cdot)*\theta\right\|_p + d(p-1)\|\theta_k\|_{p+1}^{p+1} + dkp\|\theta_k\|_p^p \\ &\leq -\frac{4mp(p-1)}{(p+m-1)^2}\int\left|\nabla\theta_k^{\frac{p+m-1}{2}}\right|^2 d\xi + C(p,d,\mathcal{K})\|\theta_k\|_{p+1}^{p+1} + C(p,d,k,\mathcal{K})\|\theta_k\|_p^p \\ &\leq -\frac{4mp(p-1)}{(p+m-1)^2}\int\left|\nabla\theta_k^{\frac{p+m-1}{2}}\right|^2 d\xi + C_A\|\theta_k\|_{p+1}^{p+1} + C_L,\end{aligned}$$

where the last line followed by interpolation and we are defining the constants C_A (which depends on $\mathcal{K}$, d and p) and C_L (which depends on $d, k, M, \mathcal{K}$ and p) for future convenience. By an appropriate Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequality, as in [20, 14, 7, 4], we have for some constant C_D (depending ultimately on d and p),

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\|\theta_k(\tau)\|_p^p \leq \left(-\frac{C_D}{\|\theta_k\|_1^{2-m}} + C_A\right)\|\theta_k\|_{p+1}^{p+1} + C_L. \tag{3.14}$$

The key point here is that control on $H[\theta|\theta_M]$ implies that $\|\theta_k\|_1$ will decrease at a known rate with increasing k (equivalent to equi-integrability) and hence used to make the first term a priori negative. Indeed,

$$\|\theta_k\|_1 \leq k^{1-m}\|\theta\|_m^m \lesssim k^{1-m}\left(H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M]) + H[\theta_M]\right). \tag{3.15}$$

Therefore, by (3.8), we can pick a $k = k_0(H[f|\theta_M], M)$ sufficiently large depending only on d,$H[f|\theta_M]$, M, p and $\mathcal{K}$ (via C_A) such that on $(\tau_0, \tau_\star)$ we have

$$-\frac{C_D}{\|\theta_k\|_1^{2-m}} + C_A < -1.$$

Hence by (3.14) and the interpolation $\|\theta\|_p^p \leq \|\theta\|_{p+1}^{p+1} + M$ (note C_L is now fixed large depending on k_0)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\tau}\|\theta_k(\tau)\|_p^p &\leq -\|\theta_k\|_{p+1}^{p+1} + C_L \\ &\leq -\|\theta_k\|_p^p + M + C_L.\end{aligned}$$

Upon integration, this yields the following:

$$\sup_{\tau\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)} \|\theta_k(\tau)\|_p^p \leq \max\left(\|f_k\|_p^p, M + C_L\right).$$

By (3.13) it follows that

$$\sup_{\tau\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)} \|\theta(\tau)\|_p^p \lesssim_p \max\left(\|f_k\|_p^p, M + C_L\right) + k_0^{p-1}M. \tag{3.16}$$

Note that the constants do not depend on $\tau_\star$. Applying the control (3.16) in (3.12) implies that over the time interval $[\tau_0, \tau_\star)$, for some $C_F = C_F(\|f\|_p, H[f|\theta_M], M, \mathcal{K}, d, p)$, we have

$$\sup_{\tau\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)} H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] \leq H[f|\theta_M] + C_F e^{-\frac{2m}{(m-1)}\epsilon\tau_0}.$$

It follows that if we choose τ_0 depending only on C_F and $H[f|\theta_M]$ then,

$$\sup_{\tau\in(\tau_0,\tau_\star)} H[\theta(\tau)|\theta_M] \leq 2H[f|\theta_M]. \tag{3.17}$$

Hence $\tau_\star = \tau_{\max}$, which implies also that (3.16) holds until $\tau_{\max}$. By the regularity theory for (1.1) it follows that $\tau_{\max} = \infty$ (see e.g. [20, 7]) and therefore both (3.16) and (3.17) hold globally in time.

Since (3.17) controls a norm with regularity higher than L^1 in the similarity variables (3.6), Theorem 1(ii) of [4] implies the optimal L^∞ decay estimate (1.9). Theorems 2 or 3 of [4] further imply as well the convergence to the Barenblatt solution at the specific rate depending on the decay of the interaction potential as stated in (1.10). □

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Adrien Blanchet, Jose A. Carrillo and Marco Di Francesco for helpful discussions. Partially supported by NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship in Mathematical Sciences, DMS-1103765.

References

[1] D Balagué, JA Carrillo, T Laurent, and G Raoul. Dimensionality of local minimizers of the interaction energy. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 209(3):1055–1088, 2013.

[2] D Balagué, JA Carrillo, T Laurent, and G Raoul. Nonlocal interactions by repulsive–attractive potentials: radial ins/stability. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 260:5–25, 2013.

[3] J. Bedrossian. Global minimizers for free energies of subcritical aggregation equations with degenerate diffusion. *Appl. Math. Letters*, 24(11):1927–1932, 2011.

[4] J. Bedrossian. Intermediate asymptotics for critical and supercritical aggregation equations and Patlak-Keller-Segel models. *Comm. Math. Sci.*, 9:1143–1161, 2011.

[5] J. Bedrossian and I. Kim. Global existence and finite time blow-up for critical Patlak-Keller-Segel models with inhomogeneous diffusion. *SIAM J. of Math. Anal.*, 45(3):934–964, 2013.

[6] J. Bedrossian and N. Rodríguez. Inhomogenous Patlak-Keller-Segel models and aggregation equations with nonlinear diffusion in $\mathbb{R}^d$. *arXiv:1108.5167, To appear in Disc. Cont. Dyn. Sys. A*, 2012.

[7] J. Bedrossian, N. Rodríguez, and A.L. Bertozzi. Local and global well-posedness for aggregation equations and Patlak-Keller-Segel models with degenerate diffusion. *Nonlinearity*, 24(6):1683–1714, 2011.

[8] A.L. Bertozzi, T. Laurent, and J. Rosado. L^p theory for the multidimensional aggregation equation. *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.*, 64(1), 2010.

[9] A.L. Bertozzi and D. Slepčev. Existence and uniqueness of solutions to an aggregation equation with degenerate diffusion. *Comm. Pure. Appl. Anal.*, 9(6):1617–1637, 2010.

[10] S. Bian and J.-G. Liu. Dynamic and steady states for multi-dimensional Keller-Segel model with diffusion exponent $m > 0$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 323(3):1017–1070, 2013.

[11] P. Biler. The Cauchy problem and self-similar solutions for a nonlinear parabolic equation. *Studia Math.*, 114(2):181–192, 1995.

[12] P. Biler, L. Corrias, and J. Dolbeault. Large mass self-similar solutions of the parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel model of chemotaxis. *J. Math. Biol.*, 61(1):1–32, 2011.

[13] A. Blanchet, E. Carlen, and J.A. Carrillo. Functional inequalities, thick tails and asymptotics for the critical mass Patlak-Keller-Segel model. *J. Func. Anal.*, to appear.

[14] A. Blanchet, J.A. Carrillo, and P. Laurençot. Critical mass for a Patlak-Keller-Segel model with degenerate diffusion in higher dimensions. *Calc. Var.*, 35:133–168, 2009.

[15] A. Blanchet, J.A. Carrillo, and N. Masmoudi. Infinite time aggregation for the critical Patlak-Keller-Segel model in $\mathbb{R}^2$. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61:1449–1481, 2008.

[16] A. Blanchet, J. Dolbeault, and B. Perthame. Two-dimensional Keller-Segel model: Optimal critical mass and qualitative properties of the solutions. *E. J. Diff. Eqn*, 2006(44):1–32, 2006.

[17] S. Boi, V. Capasso, and D. Morale. Modeling the aggregative behavior of ants of the species *p*olyergus rufescens. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 1(1):163–176, 2000. Spatial heterogeneity in ecological models (Alcalá de Henares, 1998).

[18] M. Burger, V. Capasso, and D. Morale. On an aggregation model with long and short range interactions. *Nonlin. Anal. Real World Appl.*, 8(3):939–958, 2007.

[19] Martin Burger, Marco Di Francesco, and Marzena Franek. Stationary states of quadratic diffusion equations with long-range attraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1103.5365*, 2011.

[20] V. Calvez and J.A. Carrillo. Volume effects in the Keller-Segel model: energy estimates preventing blow-up. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 86:155–175, 2006.

[21] J. Cañizo, J.A. Carrillo, and M. Schonbeck. Decay rates for a class of diffusive-dominated interaction equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 389(1):541–557, 2012.

[22] J.A. Carrillo, A. Jüngel, P.A. Markowich, G. Toscani, and A. Unterreiter. Entropy dissipation methods for degenerate parabolic problems and generalized Sobolev inequalities. *Montash. Math.*, 133:1–82, 2001.

[23] J.A. Carrillo and G. Toscani. Asymptotic L^1 decay of solutions of the porous medium equation to self-similarity. *Ind. Univ. Math. J.*, 49, 2000.

[24] L. Corrias, M. Escobedo, and J. Matos. Existence, uniqueness and asymptotic behavior of the solutions to the fully parabolic Keller-Segel system in the plane. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.2550*, 2014.

[25] L. Corrias, B. Perthame, and H. Zaag. Global solutions of some chemotaxis and angiogenesis systems in high space dimensions. *Milan J. Math.*, 72:1–28, 2004.

[26] I. Csiszar. Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observation. *Stud. Sci. Math. Hung.*, 2:299–318, 1967.

[27] J. Dolbeault and B. Perthame. Optimal critical mass in the two dimensional Keller-Segel model in $\mathbb{R}^2$. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér I Math*, 339(9):611–616, 2004.

[28] T. Gallay and E. Wayne. Invariant manifolds and the long-time asymptotics of the Navier-Stokes and Vorticity equations on $\mathbb{R}^2$. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, 163:209–258, 2002.

[29] L. Gross. Logrithmic Sobolev inequalities. *Amer. J. of Math.*, 97:1061–1083, 1975.

[30] E. M. Gurtin and R.C McCamy. On the diffusion of biological populations. *Math. Biosci.*, 33:35–47, 1977.

[31] T. Hillen and K. J. Painter. A user's guide to PDE models for chemotaxis. *J. Math. Biol.*, 58(1-2):183–217, 2009.

[32] D. Horstmann. From 1970 until present: the Keller-Segel model in chemotaxis and its consequences. *I, Jahresber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein*, 105(3):103–165, 2003.

[33] W. Jäger and S. Luckhaus. On explosions of solutions to a system of partial differential equations modelling chemotaxis. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 329(2):819–824, 1992.

[34] G. Karch and K. Suzuki. Blow-up versus global existence of solutions to aggregation equations. *arXiv:1004.4021v1*, 2010.

[35] E. F. Keller and L.A. Segel. Model for chemotaxis. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 30:225–234, 1971.

[36] I. Kim and Y. Yao. The Patlak-Keller-Segel model and its variations: properties of solutions via maximum principle. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 44(2):568–602, 2012.

[37] R. Kowalczyk. Preventing blow-up in a chemotaxis model. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 305:566–588, 2005.

[38] S. Kullback. A lower bound for discrimination information in terms of variation. *IEEE Trans. Inf.*, 4:126–127, 1967.

[39] E.H. Lieb and H-T Yau. The Chandrasekhar theory of stellar collapse a the limit of quantum mechanics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 112:147–174, 1987.

[40] P.L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. the locally compact case, part 1. *Ann. I.H.P., Anal. Nonlin.*, 1(2):109–145, 1984.

[41] S. Luckhaus and Y. Sugiyama. Large time behavior of solutions in super-critical case to degenerate Keller-Segel systems. *Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 40:597–621, 2006.

[42] S. Luckhaus and Y. Sugiyama. Asymptotic profile with optimal convergence rate for a parabolic equation of chemotaxis in super-critical cases. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 56(3):1279–1297, 2007.

[43] H. Masoud and M. Shelley. Collective surfing of chemically active particles. *To appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2014.

[44] R.J. McCann. A convexity principle for interacting gases. *Adv. Math.*, 128:153–179, 1997.

[45] P. A. Milewski and X. Yang. A simple model for biological aggregation with asymmetric sensing. *Comm. Math. Sci.*, 6(2):397–416, 2008.

[46] T. Nagai. Blow-up of radially symmetric solutions to a chemotaxis system. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 5(2):581–601, 1995.

[47] W.J. Newman. A Lyapunov functional for the evolution to the porous medium equation to self-similarity. I. *J. Math. Phys*, 25:3120–3123, 1984.

[48] F. Otto. The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation. *Comm. Part. Diff. Eqn.*, 26(1):101–174, 2001.

[49] C. S. Patlak. Random walk with persistence and external bias. *Bull. Math. Biophys.*, 15:311–338, 1953.

[50] M. Del Pino and J. Dolbeault. Best constants for Galiardo-Nirenberg inequalities and applications to nonlinear diffusions. *J. Math. Pures. Appl.*, 81:847–875, 2002.

[51] J. Ralston. A Lyapunov functional for the evolution to the porous medium equation to self-similarity. II. *J. Math. Phys*, 25:3124–3127, 1984.

[52] C. Sire and P.-H. Chavanis. Critical dynamics of self-gravitating Langevin particles and bacterial populations. *Phys. Rev. E*, 78, 2008.

[53] E. Stein. *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals.* Princeton University Press, 1993.

[54] Y. Sugiyama. Global existence in sub-critical cases and finite time blow-up in super-critical cases to degenerate Keller-Segel systems. *Diff. Int. Eqns.*, 19(8):841–876, 2006.

[55] Y. Sugiyama. The global existence and asymptotic behavior of solutions to degenerate to quasi-linear parabolic systems of chemotaxis. *Diff. Int. Eqns.*, 20(2):133–180, 2007.

[56] C. M. Topaz, A. L. Bertozzi, and M. A. Lewis. A nonlocal continuum model for biological aggregation. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 68(7):1601–1623, 2006.

[57] J.L. Vázquez. *The Porous Medium Equations.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2007.